WIKIPEDIA 25
25 years of the free encyclopedia

Talk:2026

This is the talk page for discussing improvements to the 2026 article.
This is not a forum for general discussion of the subject of the article.

- Add new text under old text.
- New to Wikipedia? Welcome! Learn to edit; get help.

Start a new topic

- Assume good faith
- Be polite and avoid personal attacks
- Be welcoming to newcomers
- Seek dispute resolution if needed

Article policies
- Neutral point of view
- No original research
- Verifiability

Find sources: Google (https://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%222026%22) (books (https://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%222026%22+-wikipedia) · news (https://www.google.com/search?tbm=nws&q=%222026%22+-wikipedia&tbs=ar:1) · scholar (https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%222026%22) · free images (https://www.google.com/search?safe=off&tbs=sur:fmc&tbm=isch&q=%222026%22+-site:wikipedia.org+-site:wikimedia.org) · WP refs (https://www.google.com/custom?hl=en&cx=007734830908295939403%3Agalkqgoksq0&cof=FORID%3A13%3BAH%3Aleft%3BCX%3AWikipedia%2520Reference%2520Search&q=%222026%22)) · FENS (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Free_English_newspaper_sources) · JSTOR (https://www.jstor.org/action/doBasicSearch?Query=%222026%22&acc=on&wc=on) · TWL (https://wikipedialibrary.wmflabs.org/search/?q=%222026%22)

Archives: 1 Auto-archiving period: **3 months**

This article was nominated for deletion on 22 October 2010 (UTC). The result of **the discussion** was **keep**.

This page was proposed for deletion by an editor in the past.

This article is rated **List-class** on Wikipedia's content assessment scale.
It is of interest to the following WikiProjects:

History: Contemporary Mid-importance

History portal

This article is within the scope of **WikiProject History**, a collaborative effort to improve the coverage of the subject of History on Wikipedia. If you would like to participate, please visit the project page, where you can join the discussion and see a list of open tasks.

Mid

This article has been rated as **Mid-importance** on the project's importance scale.

This article is supported by **the Contemporary History Task Force** (assessed as Top-importance).

Lists High-importance

This article is within the scope of **WikiProject Lists**, an attempt to structure and organize all list pages on Wikipedia. If you wish to help, please visit the project page, where you can join the project and/or contribute to the discussion.

High This article has been rated as **High-importance** on the project's importance scale.

Years Top-importance

This article is within the scope of **WikiProject Years**, a collaborative effort to improve the coverage of Years on Wikipedia. If you would like to participate, please visit the project page, where you can join the discussion and see a list of open tasks.

Top This article has been rated as **Top-importance** on the project's importance scale.

Release Of Epstein Files

Should this be added? It has severely impacted the reputations of several global figures, such as Bill Gates. And further damaged the reputations of individuals like Prince Andrew. ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 11:02, 31 January 2026 (UTC)

> https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cevnmxyy4wjo
>
> https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c4g5490xmkeo ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 11:03, 31 January 2026 (UTC)
>
> This debate has already taken place, and it was agreed that it would not be included. _-_Alsor (talk) 19:28, 31 January 2026 (UTC)
>
> > You just removed the Israeli airstrikes too, which are the most significant escalations since the ceasefire. And during a period of tenuous cessation of hostilities and the general extremely volatile situation in the surrounding Middle East, events like this are certainly noteworthy.
> >
> > Do you have somekind of neurological issue weighing scale or something?
> >
> > Why is everything just the most extreme example of a given situation in the world, or a non-event to you? ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 19:39, 31 January 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > > I remind you of the following Wikipedia policies: WP:PA, WP:AGF and WP:CIV, as well as the option that exists in the event of aggravation of your attitude: Wikipedia:Administrators' noticeboard/Incidents. I'm not going to waste my time arguing with you. _-_Alsor (talk) 20:29, 31 January 2026 (UTC)
> > >
> > > > I'll take that as Yes then… ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 23:28, 31 January 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > I lean toward **Include** on this batch of release. Unlike prior releases, there seems to be a real international reaction to this with multiple European royals and government figures being asked to testify in the US among many other public figures in business and politics. The prior releases we discussed were nothing burgers but this time around is far more significant. PaulRKil (talk) 14:56, 3 February 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > > Yeah this is my interpretation too. There have now been high profile resignations for highranking government officials in several countries

(Mandelson, for example) in addition to severe reputational damage for many global figures.

Seems like this release has real weight and is bearing real consequences. ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 15:54, 3 February 2026 (UTC)

Elon Musk appears to be another huge, global figure that has been massively impacted by the release of this latest batch.

I will just log that I think the decision not to include this release in the events list is a poor call. ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 21:26, 1 February 2026 (UTC)

Extremely damning emails from the Crown Princess of Norway etc. This is pretty big. ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 12:41, 2 February 2026 (UTC)

Indeed. I've changed my opinion following this latest batch of files, which are more impactful and implicate some big names – including Musk as you've said – plus there's now a more international dimension.

We should **include** a mention of the Epstein files on 2026. It makes the Watergate scandal look trivial by comparison. Wjfox2005 (talk) 15:09, 4 February 2026 (UTC)

I've gone ahead and tentatively added an entry. I wasn't sure how to word it and which figures to include, since there are so many. So I just went with what's there. Obviously though the entry can be edited as people see fit. ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 03:13, 5 February 2026 (UTC)

I can't believe there is the very real possibility, if not probability, that this release actually topples the current UK government. At the very least, the PM looks almost certain to be forced to resign soon. ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 15:00, 5 February 2026 (UTC)

Thanks, I added a hyperlink to people mentioned in them and fixed your source. PaulRKil (talk) 15:42, 5 February 2026 (UTC)

Ah, my bad. I'll need to figure out the cite thing before adding entries in future. ~2025-35829-97 (talk) 15:56, 5 February 2026 (UTC)

I would say that maybe a lead mention but only a lead mention? For some prominent figures like Andrew it may be appropriate to include an entry. It's one of those more gradual events which unlike the Iran War is a little harder **InvadingInvader** (userpage, talk) 12:02, 16 April 2026 (UTC)

Per WP:BLPCRIME I would remove the bit about Prince Andrew unless he's actually convicted of something. Cosmic Latte (talk) 17:17, 16 April 2026 (UTC)

exactly. It was added again, and removed again. We **should not** include arrests. WP:BLPCRIME is a fundamental wiki policy _-_Alsor (talk) 15:59, 22 April 2026 (UTC)

SCOTUS ruling on Trump Tariffs.

I believe @Alsor97 recently added an importance inline on the entry I added regarding the SCOTUS ruling on Trump's tariffs system so I wanted to open the talk page here and offer a chance for us to discuss inclusion.

For me, it feels appropriate to **include** because of how heavily the tariffs themselves were covered in 2025. This decision kills many of those tariffs and is clearly a major development in this ongoing issue. To add, while it did stop the Trump admin from imposing tariffs via the IEEPA, it lead to them imposing

a global 15% tariff via an interpretation of a different law. PaulRKil (talk) 16:08, 24 February 2026 (UTC)

> Definitely include. The tariffs have been causing global havoc ever since they were introduced, not least of all on international markets, and naturally have had generally massive global impacts economically. It has also significantly impacted the relationship between the United States and allied or neutral countries. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 17:00, 24 February 2026 (UTC)
>
> I saw the tag last night and almost said something myself. Considering the global implications of the tariffs, I agree this entry should be **included**. - Adolphus79 (talk) 17:50, 24 February 2026 (UTC)
>
> **Exclude** The usefulness of the SCOTUS ruling, and therefore its notoriety, can be seen in the moment when Trump announced and enacted new tariffs. Nothing **really** changed. Trump's tariffs are notorious, which is why they were included in 2025, not the Supreme Court ruling, which is the subject of debate, no one disputes this. _-_Alsor (talk) 20:44, 24 February 2026 (UTC)
>
> > I should specify I think the ruling itself is noteworthy. That the SCOTUS would intercede and strikedown these tariffs is notable. It's also a significant development in the overall tariff saga which will itself lead to further rulings and struggles.
> >
> > My comment above reads as if I'm merely commenting on the general tariffs themselves. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 00:44, 25 February 2026 (UTC)
>
> **Include**. I have heard this described as Trump's biggest setback so far. Lova Falk (talk) 10:25, 25 February 2026 (UTC)
>
> > As is customary everywhere, the courts do not always rule in favour of politicians (in democracy), and the SCOTUS ruling should not be included for that trivial reason. I continue to insist that Trump's tariff policy remains in force, which is what is really noteworthy and has already been the subject of discussions, negotiations and amendments between governments. _-_Alsor (talk) 22:48, 25 February 2026 (UTC)
>
> A little late but **include obviously**. **InvadingInvader** (userpage, talk) 12:01, 16 April 2026 (UTC)

Israel Terrorism Death Penalty Bill

Eh… I know this may not look great bringing up 2 global Israel controversies that have been largely amplified by people twisting and warping the actual core events (regardless of what anyone thinks of the core events).

However the recent passing of the death penalty bill for terrorists who seek to destroy the nation of Israel (that's not the verbatim wording, but it's something to that effect) championed by Ben-Gvir seems to have provoked another wave of international outcry at Israel in the space of just 2 days.

I think this one is probably a lot more serious, and likely to be a lot more longlasting than the Palm Sunday incident which seemed to be largely resolved rapidly (albeit the mass itsef was ultimately still prevented on the day).

What do you guys think? Include both? Is that too Israe-centric? I really think the death penalty bill should probably have priority if we are only going to include one.

It will likely be struck down by the Supreme Court. But the international outcry and diplomatic damage and negative optics is already done.

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cp8dkd6lnjdo ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 07:02, 1 April 2026 (UTC)

> I really don't know why the article is referring to it as targeting Palestinians specifically. Because the legal wording never mentions any specific group of people beyond terrorists with specific intentions and motives (negating the existence of the State of Israel).
>
> The controversy is, of course, that it is being PERCEIVED as being worded and structured in a way that ultimately will only target terrorists from specific groups.
>
> But the outcry and perception exists all the same. And I think any national legislation either reintroducing capital punishment or abolishing it is worthy of inclusion in the events list.
>
> Thoughts? ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 22:19, 1 April 2026 (UTC)
>
> **Endorse inclusion**. Widely covered and the outcry is why I'd say it belongs. **InvadingInvader** (userpage, talk) 12:00, 16 April 2026 (UTC)
>
> > I'm thinking the entry should be reworded to simply terrorists. Because, and correct me if I'm wrong here, the Bill itself makes no explicit mention of Palestinians (or any identity/nationality/ethnicity).
> >
> > It merely targests terrorist with a particular ideological motive, namely negating the existence of Israel.
> >
> > A short description of how it has been perceived this way (as specifically targeting Palestinian terrorists) is fine. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 16:33, 16 April 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > > So, for example, if a Jordanian or Lebanese national committed such an ideologically motivated attack in Israel. Presumably they would be tried in these military courts under this law and executed, no?
> > >
> > > If so, then the law simply does not exclusively target Palestinians whatsoever. And this entry needs to be reworded. Immediately.
> > >
> > > How it is perceived in practice and its effects in practice are of course the contentious issue, which can be mentioned.
> > >
> > > But as it stands the entry about the Bill itself appears to be blatantly factually incorrect. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 16:43, 16 April 2026 (UTC)
> > >
> > > > Uh, I'm not sure what planet you've been living on but this bill has been extremely controversial ever since it passed. It's even been discussed on large platforms like Piers Morgan Uncensored. It's appeared in countless articles on mainstream news outlets. It's been addressed by the UN and condemned by many countries (such as the UK, Germany, France etc.).
> > > >
> > > > Now I do have issues with the wording there. I do have issues with how this law is being portrayed (including on its own Wikipedia article). These are clearly taking negative perceptions of the law and how it might be abused and intended to single out and target with what the law itself actually states.
> > > >
> > > > But to act like this law is a nothingburger and nobody even mentioned it is rather insane. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 17:53, 16 April 2026 (UTC)
> > > >
> > > > > Death Penalty for Terrorists Law ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 17:55, 16 April 2026 (UTC)
>
> **Oppose** This is simply a legislative update, as the death penalty already existed in Israel. Furthermore, all the controversy surrounding the racial intent of this law is purely a matter of interpretation, and we cannot rely on interpretations, as they are subjective; in an issue

as contentious as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, it is very easy to encounter bias on both sides, although we know that this is more prevalent on one side. The law does not explicitly state a racial objective, so the entry that was included is completely erroneous and unacceptable. We shall see what happens with its implementation. _-_Alsor (talk) 11:33, 21 April 2026 (UTC)

Exclude for now unless it leads to something. Per all the reasons _-_Alsor has stated above. Ilov3gam3z (talk) 10:55, 17 May 2026 (UTC)

The Iranian Blockade

Another big flashpoint in the war. Supposedly the entire Iranian coast is to be blockaded, in addition to the Strait of Hormuz. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 13:30, 13 April 2026 (UTC)

✓ **Done** Added in Special:Diff/1348631820 by Wjfox2005. SuperPianoMan9167 (talk) 16:02, 13 April 2026 (UTC)

Thank you! ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 16:25, 13 April 2026 (UTC)

Citation needed tags

There are so many citation needed tags for scheduled events, that all lead to wikipedia pages. For instance, elections and sport events that are scheduled to be held. Readers can simply click on the wikilink, and see a whole page about that event that are well sourced. I would propose to remove those cluttering tags. When it comes to elections, the source confirming the scheduled election will be replaced with a source confirming the result of the election any way. What do you all think? Lova Falk (talk) 07:11, 22 April 2026 (UTC)

Readers should not have to click through multiple other pages to be able to verify content on this page. - Adolphus79 (talk) 15:09, 22 April 2026 (UTC)

A wikilink is one click away, just as a source. Lova Falk (talk) 05:12, 23 April 2026 (UTC)

So, the reader needs to leave this page to search another article to find a source for content on this page instead of having the source available here? - Adolphus79 (talk) 04:24, 27 April 2026 (UTC)

Off-limits to anonymous!

Hello! I would like to appreciate if the page would be potentially off-limits to anonymous by editing. ~2026-24634-50 (talk) 16:49, 22 April 2026 (UTC)

The page is not currently protected, what exactly are you requesting? - Adolphus79 (talk) 17:53, 22 April 2026 (UTC)

Isaac Accords

This is a huge, monumental, landmark moment for Israel and Latin America, and I think surely heralds good tidings and mentioning in the article. Thoughts? ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 05:44, 23 April 2026 (UTC)

Isaac Accords ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 05:46, 23 April 2026 (UTC)

Nothing on BBC News about this. Minimal coverage in other mainstream outlets. Seems too Israel-centric. Wjfox2005 (talk) 09:12, 23 April 2026 (UTC)

It's effectively an Abraham Accords for Israel and Latin America. It's fairly geopolitically significant as a starting point, given historical

relations between Israel and Latin America, and has the potential to be extremely geopolitically significant as with the Abraham Accords.

A quick Google search does indeed mainly have results from Israeli outlets, along with some Turkish and international sites such as Yahoo.

But I think this does have significant ramifications for what's currently going on in the Middle East too. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 22:27, 23 April 2026 (UTC)

Regarding Israelicentrism. It is just one of those years where LOTS of globally impactful, significant events are happening within a very short frame of time in Israel, or involving Israel. We would be remiss not to mention these things simply because of concern about the prevalence and proportional impact on the article. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 22:32, 23 April 2026 (UTC)

For example, this year has largely been dominated by Iran. Both things Iran has done itself within Iran, and things that have been done to Iran by outside forces.

Does this mean we should mention Iran less for risk of being Iraniancentric? No, of course not… In fact, if anything, the article currently neglects several major events involving Iran.

It just happens to be a critical, existential year in Iran's existence. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 01:22, 24 April 2026 (UTC)

Mali Attacks

2026 Mali attacks#:~:text=On 25 April 2026, a,Kidal and parts of Gao. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 06:01, 26 April 2026 (UTC)

✓ **Done** added a couple extra cities that are also under partial control

CautiousHabliut (talk) 20:18, 26 April 2026 (UTC)

Thank you! ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 23:31, 26 April 2026 (UTC)

Could potentially be mentioned in the year summary too, along with the already mentioned conflicts that have defined the volatility of 2026 so far… ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 02:01, 1 May 2026 (UTC)

Horn of Africa Oil Tanker Seizure

Seems potentially noteworthy given piracy had supposedly died down for a several year period.

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c78l26yn981o ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 08:49, 26 April 2026 (UTC)

They've seized another vessel.

-https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cn7871n27nlo ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 08:18, 27 April 2026 (UTC)

Another oiltanker has been seized. ~2026-87094-9 (talk) 16:39, 4 May 2026 (UTC)

Spirit Airlines

This shouldn't be included. It's only notable to the united states. barely any mention on the news. ~2026-19430-01 (talk) 21:17, 3 May 2026 (UTC)

AgreeIt is not so much the fact that it affects a specific country, but rather that this is simply another business issue, stemming from various crises (the pandemic, Iran) and affecting an airline which, although well-known in the US, is not among the most prominent, important, historic or internationally recognised. _-_Alsor (talk) 18:16, 4 May 2026 (UTC)

Exclude. If this was important enough to include, it would be featured quite prominently on BBC News, perhaps even the main headline for a while. But it's barely had any mention here in the UK. Nobody is talking about it here. Wjfox2005 (talk) 20:14, 4 May 2026 (UTC)

Strong Include. I am at a loss. A million people were stranded across the United States, Mexico, and Caribbean. We use WP:DUE, not whether it affected actual countries. If a lot of people talked about it, as clearly the US media and the UK too via BBC (https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cqxlnrqjvzyo), France24 (https://www.france24.com/en/us-airlines-step-up-as-spirit-winds-down), DW (https://www.dw.com/en/spirit-airlines-says-they-are-going-out-of-business/a-77016867), and the SCMP (https://www.scmp.com/news/world/united-states-canada/article/3352244/us-carrier-spirit-airlines-shuts-down-industrys-first-iran-war-casualty), among others. This is widely considered a casualty of the war, an effect of it almost, and to state that this is not internationally notable based on what has been stated by what we actually use as sources, furthermore the effect that even if regionally constrained has been demonstrated especially by the SCMP to have, is nothing more than a loss. **InvadingInvader** (userpage, talk) 01:07, 6 May 2026 (UTC)

I still lean exclude, or at least wait. It's clearly notable for aviation/business pages, but the main 2026 article has a higher bar. Current coverage seems largely immediate shutdown/refund/fallout coverage, and the international coverage isn't yet enough to show lasting global significance. And yes, the BBC reported it, but it simply hasn't been a prominent story. The posting of it here on 2026 was literally the first time I'd heard about it, and I'm an avid follower of BBC News. So for now, I think 2026 in aviation or 2026 in the United States would be more appropriate. If subsequent events show it had wider international consequences, or marked some kind of turning point, then it could be reassessed here. Wjfox2005 (talk) 15:06, 6 May 2026 (UTC)

I would suggest that you take a look at the ITN discussion happening regarding Spirit Airlines. Most editors are concurring that Spirit itself is a notable event, even if the article quality for posting directly to ITN is debated.

On a separate note, I wouldn't be opposed to proposing that YEARS inclusion criteria is linked in some way to ITN since they're kind of the same thing. **InvadingInvader** (userpage, talk) 16:24, 6 May 2026 (UTC)

I agree with what you say at the end; I've generally relied quite heavily on the consensus on ITN here. _-_Alsor (talk) 21:29, 7 May 2026 (UTC)

Note: ITN has had consensus for posting Spirit Airlines **InvadingInvader** (userpage, talk) 17:26, 8 May 2026 (UTC)

Hantavirus

Even if it turns out to be nothing it's still kinda a big thing ~2026-27590-22 (talk) 22:31, 6 May 2026 (UTC)

Wait. I'd prefer to see what ITN has to say about this. **InvadingInvader** (userpage, talk) 00:29, 7 May 2026 (UTC)

Support. MV Hondius hantavirus outbreak has a lot of sources, so it is widely reported. Lova Falk (talk) 07:41, 7 May 2026 (UTC)

Neutral, but leaning exclude. A dangerous virus, but the casualty count has been very low (so far). If it spreads further and becomes a significant outbreak, we could reconsider adding it. Wjfox2005 (talk) 10:36, 7 May 2026 (UTC)

Exclude for now unless the virus ends up spreading further than just the cruise ship. Jeffrey34555 (talk) 15:28, 7 May 2026 (UTC)

Exclude, for now per all above. For the time being, this is a sensationalist ongoing situation due to the coronavirus outbreak, which is quite natural. So far, the number of people infected and those who have died is minimal, and there has been no international impact, with no containment measures in place beyond general advice. _-_Alsor (talk) 21:28, 7 May 2026 (UTC)

~~**Exclude**. This stuff happens all the time. — Preceding unsigned comment added by AntonyBlink (talk • contribs) 01:04, 9 May 2026 (UTC)~~ (Blocked sockpuppet of Oatsandcream (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Oatsandcream), see investigation) --Belbury (talk) 08:10, 14 May 2026 (UTC)

It is actually somewhat novel due to the human to human transmission aspect.

I think it's worth including. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 00:25, 13 May 2026 (UTC)

Exclude. The only reason this virus is getting international coverage is due to the recent Covid-19 pandemic. The only abnormal aspect about this virus is the human to human transmission, but the andesvirus strain of Hantavirus has already been known to have such capabilities. Most news coverage of this event is tabloid and sensational. There has been a similar outbreak before in Yellowstone I believe, although not human-to-human. Consensus also seems to be that this virus is slow transmissable and will most likely fizzle into nothing. The R0 and mortality rate also seems to suggest this will simply be a fad, and an unimportant one at that. Ilov3gam3z (talk) 21:29, 16 May 2026 (UTC)

With so many people thinking that it should be excluded from the article (even though I am not one of them), it should definitely not be mentioned **in the lead**, and therefore I will remove it from the lead. Lova Falk (talk) 09:33, 21 May 2026 (UTC)

Well, there's definitely less of an argument for it in the lede than in the Events list, for sure. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 11:16, 21 May 2026 (UTC)

I believe it should at least be in the lead, even though it's pretty much over at the time of writing; it still should be in the lead, as it was a major scare this month. Therefore, I have re-added it to the lead. ([[User talk:#126;2026-28786-09]]) 10:44, 21 May 2026 (UTC)
— Preceding unsigned comment added by Sterlingfn (talk • contribs)

I will delete this again. An event that just barely made it into the timeline is definitely not worth being part of the lead. Only the most important events of 2026 should be in the lead. Lova Falk (talk) 08:02, 28 May 2026 (UTC)

i believe that is an important event, fact is it was discussed by major news networks and newspapers. This is worth being a part of the lead at the very least, and many people don't even know about the random stuff in the timeline anyway like the bahama election (no offense but i think more people care about Hantavirus than that outside of the bahamas) so i will once again add it to the lead. Sterlingfn (talk) 13:04, 28 May 2026 (UTC)

But in the lead? Sure, minor things are apt to be in the timeline, but Hantavirus in the lead? It's basically over now when it comes to news coverage and it also seems the whole outbreak of it has mostly passed. It was more of a pop culture fad/meme then an actual important event, and why would we put a meme in the lead of a year article? Ilov3gam3z (talk) 20:53, 28 May 2026 (UTC)

You also re-added the section even after getting a clear exclude from this talk page section, although it was undone by CluebotNG. I am going to give you a warning for this. Ilov3gam3z (talk) 20:55, 28 May 2026 (UTC)

And did this multiple times, I may add. Ilov3gam3z (talk) 20:59, 28 May 2026 (UTC)

And what about Ebola outbreak in DRC? ~2026-32705-16 (talk) 03:26, 3 June 2026 (UTC)

Ebola has already been included in the lead. Ilov3gam3z (talk) 13:38, 3 June 2026 (UTC)

Look, if you want it in the timeline, then add it. It's fine with me to put it in the lead or timeline, I don't care, but what you should be doing is at least adding it somewhere to this article. It was still an important health event and should be added to the timeline. user: sterlingfn (talk) 9:19, 02 June 2026 (UTC)

Ebola Outbreak

An Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has now been declared a Public Health Emergency of International Concern.

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cze2wpk7y76o ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 06:04, 17 May 2026 (UTC)

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c2l2p0wwzzdo ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 06:07, 17 May 2026 (UTC)

Include. Because why not? Seems decently important. Ilov3gam3z (talk) 10:49, 17 May 2026 (UTC)

Especially with the 80 deaths the article suggests. Ilov3gam3z (talk) 10:50, 17 May 2026 (UTC)

its now more than 100 ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 17:17, 25 May 2026 (UTC)

Include. Yeah... the casualty count, plus WHO's declaration, both warrant inclusion now. Let's hope the outbreak is contained quickly! Wjfox2005 (talk) 20:05, 17 May 2026 (UTC)

Should add there is deep uncertainty and alarm over the true number of infections and deaths right now. So potentially already a far larger and more widespread outbreak promoting the classification. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 20:13, 17 May 2026 (UTC)

about the 2026 event collage thing

why does that collage of the 2026 events keep appearing

"2026 fifa world cup is held"

how is this possible?? ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 17:16, 25 May 2026 (UTC)

> @ArionStar, @Josephguy15, and @BFDIFan928, discuss about the collage here.
>
> ArionStar, get consensus before implementing the collage. It includes the World Cup and the Oympics which hasn't happened so far. Setarip (talk) 23:55, 25 May 2026 (UTC)
>
> > I only kept the collage just because it's good that the collage is on display for other editors to add their suggestions. ArionStar (talk) 01:02, 26 May 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > > then wait till december 31 2026 bro ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 05:33, 26 May 2026 (UTC)
> > >
> > > > Ok bro ArionStar (talk) 17:40, 26 May 2026 (UTC)
> > > >
> > > > > If the death toll from the 2026 Venezuela earthquakes surpasses 1,000, we should reconsider its inclusion in the annual collage. I think it should replace the MV Hondius hantavirus outbreak. Nagae Iku (talk) 12:34, 25 June 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > le 2026 winter olympics has already happened
> >
> > ONLY the mundial 2026 hasnt happened yet ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 05:30, 26 May 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > > Oh, right. The Olympics has gotten so irrelevant for me that I didn't even know it already took place. I'm not sure why we even put it in the Collage every time anyways, it happens every 2 years. Setarip (talk) 13:03, 26 May 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > I feel like we should wait till next year to add a collage for a couple reasons. 1. Because we still have another 6 months this year. 2. I don't think that collages should be constantly edited whenever something new happens, for example, the 2013 collage for a while was always being edited, so it doesn't really show what the collage is for, is events will just change and leave. And 3. For most of Wikipedia collages for years, they were added the year after the year in the article, or very late in that year, so it makes sense to stick to tradition BFDIFan928 (talk) 11:37, 27 May 2026 (UTC)

The election source was accidentally removed while editing the June 1, 2026 area

I was working on editing the June 1, 2026 section. I accidentally replaced the original source that talks about that scheduled Ethiopian election with the video of that specific Maltese factory exploding. Can you please help? This article should be protected for a few hours after that to prevent this from happening again. ~2026-32705-16 (talk) 03:25, 3 June 2026 (UTC)

> I took a look at the edit history, and I wasn't able to find the change. Are you sure you made that change? Can you provide a link to the edit where the change was made? -- irn (talk) 16:11, 3 June 2026 (UTC)

> > I made that change on accident. It wasn't vandalism. And now I cannot edit any article/page because someone from my exact same IP address violated multiple rules and now I have to wait for 4 days. ~2026-32705-16 (talk) 22:01, 22 June 2026 (UTC)
> > > All the more reason to register your own account! :) - Adolphus79 (talk) 22:15, 22 June 2026 (UTC)
> @~2026-32705-16 ~2026-33512-85 (talk) 07:45, 7 June 2026 (UTC)

Iran’s Latest Belligerence

Iran’s latest bombardment of Israel should be included. A stalemate had existed since April and this is a dangerous escalation. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 00:14, 8 June 2026 (UTC)

Elon Musk trillionaire status

I see this has already been added under 12 June. Although I'm 100% in favour of including this (***when it happens***), the major wealth trackers don't yet seem to agree that he's crossed the US$1 trillion threshold. Forbes' real-time tracking (https://www.forbes.com/real-time-billionaires/) currently has him at $985bn, while Bloomberg (https://www.bloomberg.com/billionaires/) has him at $971bn. Reuters has reported him as the world's first trillionaire, but its calculation has a different methodology. I'm sure the situation will change fairly quickly – so perhaps we could wait just a little longer for more news/verification? Wjfox2005 (talk) 14:36, 12 June 2026 (UTC)

> Multiple, reputable sources now confirming it... including Forbes and BBC News. So ignore my previous post :-) Wjfox2005 (talk) 17:28, 12 June 2026 (UTC)

Updated refs

There are several entries in May and June (that's all I checked before writing this, other months may also be the same) that are using refs from a month or more before the event. We need updated refs that say the event actually happened, not that it will or might happen. There needs to be some kind of standard that we update the ref when we move it from the "Scheduled events" section, instead of just copy/pasting the entry with the out-of-date ref. - Adolphus79 (talk) 14:40, 12 June 2026 (UTC)

I was looking onto where I could put the website and the info of June 1 of the fireworks factory explosion in Malta

Hello, I tried to put the info of the explosion factory in Malta that took place on June 1, 2026. Do you know why it suddenly got removed? Was this vandalism by someone or the owner removed it? ~2026-32705-16 (talk) 23:35, 12 June 2026 (UTC)

Rec Room end of support date

Hello, I was wondering if we can add that Rec Room reached it's end on June 1, 2026? ~2026-35015-44 (talk) 05:32, 15 June 2026 (UTC)

> Non-notable for this page. Wjfox2005 (talk) 09:13, 15 June 2026 (UTC)
>
> > does this guy not know Wikipedia:Notability? ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 10:30, 15 June 2026 (UTC)

regarding the [citation needed] and [needs update] in 2026

yea so i was reading the 2026 until i saw so many of these [citation needed] and [needs update]

from elections to even the mundial 2026.

could anyone take care of these types of refs that appear everywhere? ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 10:27, 15 June 2026 (UTC)

> like how did no one (but me) noticed these? ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 10:29, 15 June 2026 (UTC)
>
> You are not the only person that noticed this, I am the one that added (most of) them. And yes, anyone can add the updated source(s). - Adolphus79 (talk) 13:23, 15 June 2026 (UTC)

Excessively Long Year Summary

Can we tighten open the summary a bit? It’s excessive right now. I think we can trim the Epstein part and the World Cup part. And the part about Musk becoming the first trillionaire.

That should suffice, for now. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 17:43, 19 June 2026 (UTC)

> The Epstein files have been a major story this year. The World Cup is the biggest sporting event of the last four years. And Musk becoming the first trillionaire is clearly notable. So I'd say keep the events as-is, but slightly tweak the lede wording if you're concerned about word count. Wjfox2005 (talk) 10:11, 20 June 2026 (UTC)
>
> > They were big events, at the time. But in a year of even bigger events, I think we can safely relegate them to the Events list.
> >
> > The World Cup happens every 4 years. The novelty of its expansion or being hosted by 3 separate countries doesn’t really warrant year summary inclusion . ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 17:49, 20 June 2026 (UTC)
> >
> > > The Epstein files are objectively the biggest political scandal in history, and are ongoing. The World Cup is ***the*** sporting event of the year, watched by billions. And one person reaching a net worth equal to half the world's population is highly notable. So we aren't going to remove these from the lede. Like I said, trim their wording if you want. But they stay. Wjfox2005 (talk) 20:09, 20 June 2026 (UTC)

It literally happens every 4 years. It simply isn't a year defining event that needs to be included in the lede.

Epstein Files have been ongoing for years, they've been a major recurring news story since 2019.

Outside of the late January releases, they have barely featured in the news this year. They hardly define 2026 in the same way as, say, the Iran War or even the recent Ebola outbreak or the Apollo Moon mission.

World's first trillionaire is arguably the only exclusion candidate I mentioned worthy of being included in the year summary. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 00:56, 21 June 2026 (UTC)

- Artemis

~2026-28786-09 (talk) 00:58, 21 June 2026 (UTC)

Requesting a change within the "year in various calendars"

The current Buddhist year is 2569, not 2570. If you look at what the Thai language, Wikipedia says it will list 2569 as the current year so please change that. ~2026-37020-86 (talk) 16:19, 27 June 2026 (UTC)

Should the crash be addressed?

As some of you know, a small propeller plane had crashed into the China Zun on June 26, 2026. Now that there is a bit more information, should we add it to this article? Or should we keep it in the China Zun article? Spongycake (talk) 16:36, 29 June 2026 (UTC)

Minor story, not worth including. Wjfox2005 (talk) 18:27, 1 July 2026 (UTC)

Long Shutdown 3

The CERN LHC is about to undergo Long Shutdown 3, scheduled to last until sometime in 2028.

This warrants mentioning. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 06:48, 30 June 2026 (UTC)

Better suited to 2026 in Science, I would suggest. Wjfox2005 (talk) 18:26, 1 July 2026 (UTC)

No, it isn't. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 00:24, 2 July 2026 (UTC)

Also, we should include the Venezuela earthquake in the year summary, and remove the stupid part about the conservative wave in South America. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 02:24, 2 July 2026 (UTC)

Roman Catholic Church 2026 Society of Saint Pius X Excommunications

2026 Écône consecrations

This should be included in the Events list. ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 08:54, 3 July 2026 (UTC)

✓ **Done** Thanks! -- irn (talk) 15:19, 3 July 2026 (UTC)

Thank you, goodsir! ~2026-28786-09 (talk) 18:41, 3 July 2026 (UTC)

about the nations championship in the 2026 later lacking importance

you know how someone added the scheduled inaugural nations championship in the 2026 article but when it began a [importance?] was added

how? ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 05:18, 9 July 2026 (UTC)

how did u put that nations championship in the 2026 article, only to get [importance?] when it began? ~2026-31288-76 (talk) 10:43, 10 July 2026 (UTC)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:2026&oldid=1363508005"